

REMARKS

All claims stand rejected. The independent claims are claims 1, 18, 21, 24, and 27. Regarding the claim objections, the word “said” is now replaced with “the” in claims 1, 18, 21, 24, and 27. Claim 11 is cancelled. Regarding the term “computer-readable medium” in claims 21 and 23, Applicant respectfully notes that this term was used in claim 11 of the application as originally filed; the Detailed Description is now amended to include this material.

All of the present amendments are fully supported by the specification as originally filed, and none of the introduce any new matter.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Office Action cites the following two limitations in claim 1, and says that they are not supported by the specification:

- I. “said revised version having been revised during a time interval after said showing of the content according to said second rendering mode, and before said using the information to show the revised version....”
- II. “wherein said revised version of the content has been revised between said request to close the content and said next access, even if said indication whether to save the second rendering mode was affirmative.”

Regarding the first limitation (I), Applicant notes that much of this limitation was already in claim 1 prior to the most recent response of November 21, 2008. The Office Action asserts (at page 4, line 10) that “there is no indication that” the user does not still have access to the content during the time after said showing step. But it is unclear to Applicant whether the Office Action means that there is “no indication” in the claim, or instead means that there is “no indication” in the original specification. The Office Action further states that, when collecting the request to close the content, the content still has not been closed and, as such, it would be reasonable for the user to still have access to the content unless “otherwise stated.” Again, it is unclear to Applicant whether the Office Action

means that this is not “otherwise stated” in the claim, or instead means that this is not “otherwise stated” in the original specification. Applicant respectfully requests that if the next Office Action discusses Applicant’s indications or statements, that the Office Action clarify whether the Office Action is referring to the claims, or is instead referring to the originally-filed specification.

Still regarding the first limitation (I), Applicant now amends it to more closely track the originally-filed specification, by clarifying that the content was revised during a time interval between the accessing and the next access. Page 4 (lines 21-23) of the originally-filed application explains that the content has been “ changed...during the time interval when the user was not accessing it.” Likewise, page 3 (lines 15-17) of the originally-filed application explains that the content may change between downloads. Applicant will accordingly now amend the first limitation (I) to more closely track these portions of the specification.

Regarding the second limitation (II), it is similarly amended. Applicant respectfully submits that these amendments overcome any problems under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

All independent claims stand rejected as obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) from *Robotham* (U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0015042) in view of *Kendall* (U.S. Patent Application 2005/0193053) and in further view of a new reference: *Kraus* (U.S. Patent No. 6,266,684). The pending independent claims are method claim 1, method claim 18, software claim 21, terminal claim 24, and terminal claim 27.

Amended Claims are Not Disclosed or Suggested by the Cited References

Applicant respectfully submits that none of the cited references teach or suggest the present claimed feature of revising content between accesses, even if there is an indication to save the rendering mode.

The final Office Action (at page 7, line 2) cites the *Kraus* reference regarding saving changes upon closing content. Although the cited portions of *Kraus* disclose saving content (e.g. see the cited column 7, lines 3-5: “contents of the first frame 52 are saved”), that is very different from saving a rendering mode even if content changes between accesses.

Figure 11 of *Kraus* indicates a save operation for saving a “frameset”, which *Kraus* defines at column 2, lines 26-27 as a “layout”. However, there is no suggestion in *Kraus* to change content between accesses as presently claimed, and no suggestion that the layout or rendering mode would be unalterable (i.e. saved) during those content changes.

This gap in *Kraus* is not filled by the other cited references. See, for example, Figure 7 of *Kendall*, which shows that additional preferences are received 53, and are then automatically stored 54, without any inquiry to the user about whether the user wants the additional preferences to be stored. This is a very substantial difference from the present claimed invention, because the present invention allows a user to experiment with various different rendering modes after opening content in a first rendering mode, while also allowing the user to close the content without affecting the first rendering mode that will be used when the content is visited again in the future.

Likewise, the cited *Robotham* reference does not teach or suggest the features of present amended claim 1. For example, paragraph 502 of *Robotham* does not suggest the present claimed inquiry to the user about whether to save the current rendering mode, even though content is changed between accesses.


CONCLUSION

The arguments presented above regarding claim 1 apply equally to the other independent claims. Because the cited reference does not teach or suggest critical elements of the present amended independent claims, it is respectfully submitted that these present claims are novel and patentable. Early allowance of the pending independent claims and the claims depending therefrom is consequently requested. Applicant would be grateful if the Examiner would please contact Applicant's attorney by telephone if the Examiner detects anything in the present response that might hinder a speedy allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 5/26/09

WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER
SLUYS & ADOLPHSON LLP
Building Five, Bradford Green
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, CT 06468
Telephone: (203) 261-1234
Facsimile: (203) 261-5676
USPTO Customer No. 004955


Andrew T. Hyman
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 45,858